

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application and withdrawal of the final rejection is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1.

Initially, the examiner is thanked for the courtesy extended to the applicant's attorney during a personal interview conducted on October 30, 2003. During this interview, the application was discussed including claim 1 as previously presented. Furthermore, the single prior art referenced, the 3DZoneMaster, also was discussed and it was pointed out to the examiner that the 3DZoneMaster is in effect a wireless mouse that operates in two dimensions. It was further indicated that the 3DZoneMaster is only capable of determining a point in space not a point in space plus orientation. No agreements were reached during that interview.

In the final rejection, the examiner has continued to reject claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 10 as anticipated by the 3DZoneMaster device collectively referenced in the four web pages noted in the Official action. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to claim 1 as amended.

Please note that claim 1 has been amended by inserting the word "direct" before projection to indicate that the projection of the shooting axis onto the screen defines an impact position. It is contended that there is adequate support for this addition to claim 1 from the drawings in the application as filed. In this regard, it is clear from the drawings that the pistol 1 directly projects onto the display system 3. This is shown by the triangle lines impacting the schematic illustration of the display system 3 in Fig. 1. Because the 3DZoneMaster does not directly interact with the display system, the anticipation rejection would appear obviated and therefore should be withdrawn.

In the Official action, the examiner has also rejected claims 4-5, 7, 9, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the 3DZoneMaster discussed above. In this regard, it is the examiner's position that the additional limitations would be obvious variants of the 3DZoneMaster device. This rejection as it applies to the claims now presented for reexamination is respectfully traversed.

With regard to the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as well as the other claims, it is respectfully contended that the 3DZoneMaster does not disclose or suggest a device as


Appl. No. 09/719,706  
Amdt. dated November 21, 2003  
Reply to O.A. of August 21, 2003

presently claimed. In this regard, as noted above, the 3DZoneMaster does not directly interact with the display system. It also does not describe a shooting axis as now presently claimed.

For these reasons it is contended that this application now is in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

McCracken & Frank  
Attorneys at Law  
200 W. Adams  
Suite 2150  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 263-4700

By:   
J. William Frank III  
Reg. No: 25,626

November 21, 2003